

lication of the previous edition; among which we observe chloral, bromide of mercury, iodide of methyl, bichloride of methylene, and apomorphia. He also gives more extended notices of other remedies which, though not strictly new, have, of late years, acquired increased importance as therapeutic agents; as, for example, bromide of potassium, physostigma, carbolic and sulphurous acids, the alkaline hypophosphites, etc.

Notwithstanding these additions, Mr. Waring has, by careful pruning, avoided any increase in the bulk of the volume. The judiciousness, however, of diminishing the number of references to authorities is doubtful; in our opinion, the value of the work was much enhanced by the very numerous foot-note references which it contained, constituting it, indeed, a complete dictionary of therapeutics.

With the manner in which the author treats each article our readers are familiar (see notice of previous edition in No. of this Journal for January, 1867, page 239).

Mr. Waring has ably performed his task of collecting and bringing together the opinions and experience of the most eminent writers, as to the real value of the articles of the *materia medica* in the treatment of disease; and in this third edition he keeps pace with the recent progress of therapeutics. To the practising physician "Waring's Therapeutics" is an extremely valuable aid in enlarging his resources for the treatment of disease.

I. M. H.

ART. XLIII.—*The Harveian Oration delivered at the Royal College of Physicians, London, June 24th, 1870, by WILLIAM GULL, M.D., F.R.S.* 8vo. pp. 52. London: John Churchill & Sons.

IN this oration Dr. Gull has departed from the custom of Harveian orators of lauding the splendour of the illustrious founder's discoveries, or of justifying the scientific method he employed in making them, considering it rather his duty to endeavour to fulfil "Harvey's intention by moving our minds to a consideration of our position as students of medicine, and to encourage a further search into nature's mysteries." In so doing, he immediately falls in with one of the most mooted points in modern science. Life, or rather vital force, having been asserted to be "a power entirely different from, and in no way correlated with, matter and its ordinary forces," would, if so regarded, present an impassable barrier to scientific observation, which only takes note of matter and its ordinary forces. Therefore our author proceeds to criticize the above assertion, showing that living matter does not generate any new power, but only varies the form of physical force; that the admission of physical properties belonging to bioplasm includes the further admission of their correlation with "life-force," and that although the maxim *omne vivum ex ovo* may be true in a majority of instances, the question of spontaneous generation is still an open one. "Science may probably never be able to give an account of the primitive germs of living things, if only because the primeval conditions of the world cannot repeat themselves for our investigation," but whether the masses, germs, or ova, as they may happen to be called, which are thrown off at times by living things, are as limited and specific as we have hitherto regarded them, is the *questio vexata* of the day. The explanation of a Divine Power being the first cause does not, says Dr. Gull,

obviate secondary causes, or explain the processes which lie between the extremes of existence. This region is the proper domain of science, and that which is at present inconceivable in it may be made clear by the advancement of knowledge.

The author next speaks of a subject now much under discussion, and which touches our duty to society, namely, of the use of every means which lies within our power of preventing disease; for it is undoubtedly our imperative duty to limit, and if possible to blot out, all diseases of whatever kind. He truly says, "if we may not without the charge of temerity venture to assign the *why* in physical causes, how much more open are we to the charge when we set up ourselves as judges of the moral purposes of disease?" With an emphatic warning to all students of nature to remember that they are viewing the truth each from his own centre rather than from *the* centre, the book comes to an end, leaving the impression that its author is a worthy representative of his great master, Harvey, and one whose broad ideas and generosity of sentiment will insure him a fair hearing by all liberal-minded physicians. L. S. S.

---

ART. XLIV.—*Notes on Comparative Anatomy. A Syllabus of a Course of Lectures delivered at St. Thomas's Hospital.* By WILLIAM MILLER ORD, M.B. Lond.; Assistant Physician to the Hospital, and Lecturer on Physiology and on Comparative Anatomy in its Medical School. 8vo. pp. 203. London: J. & A. Churchill, 1871.

This little volume is designed to give a sketch of the facts treated in the author's lectures, and should be read from the stand-point of the student. The matter herein contained is arranged upon the basis of zoology. This, we think, is a mistake. The idea presented to the mind of the student should be *function through structure*. A merely zoological framework gives this indifferently. On pages 170 and 171 the author presents two classifications of the mammalia, without stating to which one he gives preference. This is a necessary consequence of the plan which he has adopted of arranging his materials.

Errors of statement are not more frequent than they are apt to be in books of this kind. We are a little surprised, however, to find, among the characters by which the Rodentia are distinguished, the following: "Orbits not separated from temporal fossæ." The vast majority of mammals possess this feature. The author's definition of a bat would exclude many well-known forms. He says definitely that frugivorous bats "have little or no tail." The collections of London would show at least one remarkable exception to this statement. But it is scarcely fair to dwell upon these and similar mistakes, in view of the really capital account of very many points of structure. This is particularly noticeable in descriptions of the lower forms.

Again we are to note that curious and ungenerous neglect of American scientific labour on the part of Englishmen. One might suppose that Clarke, Morse, and Hyatt had never contributed a line to scientific literature, were we to rest content with Mr. Ord's recognition of them. His lectures would have been all the more interesting, we judge, had he introduced the novel and interesting observation of these gentlemen in his account of the Infusoria, Mollusca, and the fresh-water Palyzoa.

H. A.